

**H**

(T  
(B  
(D  
(W  
(H

NO

# DOMINION ELECTION.

CAMPAIGN OF 1886.

## Hon. Edward Blake's Speeches.

No. 12, (First Series).

(TORONTO)—The Interests of Labour.

(BELLEVILLE)—Legislation for Labour.

(DESERONTO)—Workingmen and Parties.

(WELLAND)—To Knights of Labour.

(HAMILTON)—Who Released the Printers?

NOTE.—See Inside Cover for List of Mr. Blake's Speeches in first Series. Apply to W. T. R. Preston, Reform Club, Toronto, for Copies of these Speeches.

Toronto:

HUNTER, ROSE & CO., PRINTERS.

1886.

## LIST OF SPEECHES IN THIS SERIES.

- No. 1.—(LONDON): General Review of Situation. Riel Question.  
(OWEN SOUND): North-West Maladministration. Riel.
- No. 2.—(BEAVERTON): Independence of Parliament. The Boodle Brigade.
- No. 3.—(CHESLEY): Public Finances—Taxation and Deficits—Farmers.
- No. 4.—(SIMCOE): Federal and Provincial Rights—Ontario—Nova Scotia.  
(GUELPH)—Elections near.—Tory Dodges—Nova Scotia.
- No. 5.—(OWEN SOUND): Principles of Liberalism—Duty of the Leader.  
(WELLAND)—Policy of the Party—Functions of an Opposition.  
(OAKWOOD)—Sir J. Macdonald on Functions of an Opposition.
- No. 6.—*Extracts*—(GUELPH): Home Rule for Ireland.  
(BERLIN): Firebrand Tory attempts to excite Germans.  
(GALT & ORANGEVILLE): Indian Starvation Policy.  
(PEMBROKE): Maladministration felt at Cut Knife Hill.
- No. 7.—*Extracts*—(KENDALL): Business Methods required in Public Affairs  
—Degradation of Parliament—A few Boodlers.  
(HAMPTON): Civil Service Reform.  
(GALT): Burden of Public Debt.  
(ORANGEVILLE): Burden of Public Debt.  
(BELLEVILLE): Burden of Public Debt—The Interest on Debt.  
(OAKWOOD): Burden of Public Debt—Our Public Expenditure.
- No. 8.—(NEWCASTLE): Canadian Pacific Railroad Matters.  
(LISTOWEL): Canadian Pacific Railroad Matters—The last Sacrifice of \$10,000,000—Collapse of Tory "Boom" Policy.  
(ST. THOMAS): North-West Lands.  
(HUNTSVILLE): R.R. Policy—Sir John's Subsidies to "Guinea-Pig" Directors—Assisted Immigration and Railway Frauds.  
(PARRY SOUND): Railway Policy of Liberals.  
(ORANGEVILLE): Railway Policy of Liberals.  
(BRANTFORD): The Kansas Slander.  
(LISTOWEL): The Sea of Mountains.
- No. 9.—(WINGHAM): Blake's Tribute to Mackenzie.  
(STAYNER): Blake's Tribute to Sir Richard Cartwright.  
(BRANTFORD): Blake's Tribute to Paterson—Duty of Young Men.
- No. 10.—(WELLAND): Liberal Party, Creeds and Classes.  
(ORILLIA): Leaders and Newspapers—The "Mail" Crusade.
- No. 11.—(AYLMER): Prohibition and Politics.
- No. 12.—(TORONTO): Interests of Labour—The Tariff.  
(WELLAND): To Knights of Labour.  
(BELLEVILLE): Legislation for Labour.  
(DESERONTO): Workingmen and Parties.  
(HAMILTON): Workingmen and Parties.
- No. 13.—(HAMILTON): Provincial Issues—The Religious Cry—Liberals and Catholics.
- No. 14.—(LINDSAY): North-West Affairs—Neglect, Delay and Mismanagement—Race and Creed Cries.

# LEGISLATION FOR LABOUR.

Sir John Macdonald's Pretensions Discussed.

## LIBERALS AND THE TARIFF.

### RELATIONS OF LABOUR AND CAPITAL.

#### Remedies and Non-Remedies.

#### Total Abstinence Cures many Evils.

Mr. Chairman, friends and fellow-citizens, I have been asked to address you to-night, not upon certain political questions of the day, which have been specially engaging the attention of the public at large during the last few months, but upon topics particularly affecting

#### THE INTERESTS OF THE WORKING CLASSES

of Canada—(applause)—a subject not lending itself readily to passion, to rhetoric, or declamation, not so easily enlivened as some topics may be in discussion, but yet a subject which

#### MUST BE PROFOUNDLY INTERESTING

to every man who has a brain to think, or a heart to feel. (Renewed applause.) We would be unworthy of our place in the world, if we did not feel the deepest concern in the condition of the masses—the toiling masses; and the inquiry what that condition is, what their troubles are, what remedy may be found, what improvement may be effected, ought to enlist our best energies in the search for its solution. Now, I had intended to discuss to-night a large portion of the speech lately delivered by the First Minister especially directed to workingmen, in which he engaged in a retrospective commentary upon transactions of some years back, with the desire and intent of painting in very brilliant colours the record of the Conservative party, and in correspondingly dark colours, the record of the Liberal party. He raised the question of the printers' arrest of 1872, and his legislation in that connection; he discussed the subjects of Chinese labour, of contract

labour in penitentiaries, and of savings bank deposits. But he omitted some other topics of the past, such as

#### THE ATTEMPTED FACTORY LEGISLATION,

(applause) which would also be, in some respects, interesting. Upon all these questions, I believe a complete answer is to be given to the speech to which I refer, but there are upon the platform to-night several speakers whom you are anxious to hear. I cannot encroach upon their time; and therefore I defer for the moment dealing with these questions of the past; but I undertake to dispose of them at an early day. I will simply say, with regard to one of them, that it was an extraordinary omission on the part of the First Minister that, engaged as he was in a historical retrospect, he forgot altogether to mention that the

#### CRIMINAL OFFENCES ACT

which he professed to have made right in 1872, was not made right until 1876, when I had the honour and satisfaction of introducing legislation, in advance of the laws then enacted in England, *which eliminated the features of class legislation in Sir John Macdonald's Act; which removed the prohibition he had retained against the workmen watching places of business for certain purposes connected with their combinations; which gave to those charged with offences under the law the inestimable privilege of a trial by jury, instead of before magistrates, as under his law; and which, most important of all, abrogated the application to this class of transactions of the odious law of conspiracy, through which things lawful for one workingman to do had been construed, under the law as he left it, to be criminal when done in concert by two or more.* (Applause.) He forgot also to refer to the fact that in the following year, when I was still Minister of Justice, I induced Parliament to amend the laws which

#### MADE AN ODISIOUS DISTINCTION

between different breaches of contract, which made all breaches of contract of service criminal, while all other breaches of contract were merely civil offences, and to incorporate in the legislation still deemed necessary on the subject the just principle of equal dealing with all classes of the community in like cases offending, instead of the old and arbitrary plan of making one law for the workingman and another for the rest of the world. (Loud applause.) He likewise omitted from that retrospective history the fact that in 1882, *contrary to my protest*, Parliament under his guidance established the proposition that a Stipendiary Magis-

trate, without a jury, should have power to try, and to condemn, and to inflict a penalty of five years in the penitentiary upon those charged with the apparently trivial offences dealt with by the Seamen's Act. And he equally forgot to allude to the circumstance that,

#### CONTRARY TO THE PROTEST OF THE REFORM PARTY,

notwithstanding his professed anxiety to advance the interests of labour, he had established a sort of penal disqualification, a money obstacle to candidatures for Parliament by requiring a deposit of \$200 as a condition of nomination for the honourable position of a representative of the people. (Cheers.) Now, on all these subjects I have spoken in 1882, and I intend to speak soon again. But I could not approach this attempted retrospect without this brief reference to the salient features of Liberal action and legislation in the interests of labour, legislation which I believe to be the most important recorded in our statute book. (Loud and prolonged applause.) The First Minister claimed great credit for having improved the condition of affairs, particularly as affecting the workingmen, by the tariff. Now, the tariff was enacted in 1879, and in 1882 he appealed to the people. And his appeal was based upon the need to obtain a renewed lease of power, which he assured the people would, if obtained, render

#### THE TARIFF ABSOLUTELY PERMANENT

and beyond all danger of attack. He obtained that lease. He has enjoyed and used it. But another election approaches. Those who are well informed on the Conservative side say, whatever they may think, that it is not so very near. Those who have some sources of information on the Liberal side believe it to be much nearer. At any rate it approaches. As the election approaches you find, notwithstanding the pledge of 1882 as to the results of a fresh lease of power, the cry is raised again, "The tariff is in danger! To save the tariff you must once again return the Conservatives to office."

If it be so that it is necessary to give the Conservative party a third lease of power in order to save the tariff, all I can say is that this is an acknowledgment that the principal pledge made by the Government at the last election has not been fulfilled, and that

#### THEY HAVE FAILED TO ACCOMPLISH

the promise on which they were returned. (Great applause.) I desire to refer very briefly to the



# ATTITUDE OF THE LIBERAL PARTY UPON THE QUESTION OF THE TARIFF.

It has been grossly misrepresented. In 1882 I stated my views upon that subject in the most formal manner, by means of the address I issued to the electors of West Durham as a manifesto to the country; by the principles then laid down I still abide. I said:—

You know well that I do not approve of needless restrictions on our liberty of exchanging what we have for what we want, and do not see that any substantial application of the restrictive principle has been or can be, made in favour of the great interests of the mechanic, the labourer, the farmer, the lumberman, the ship-builder or the fisherman. But you know also that I have fully recognized the fact that we are obliged to raise yearly a great sum made greater by the obligations imposed on us by this Government; and that we must continue to provide this yearly sum mainly by import duties, laid to a great extent on goods similar to those which can be manufactured here; and that it results as a necessary incident of our settled fiscal system that there must be a large, and, as I believe, in the view of moderate-protectionists, an ample advantage to the home manufacturer.

*Our adversaries wish to present to you an issue as between the present tariff and absolute free trade.*

*That is not the true issue.*

*Free trade is, as I have repeatedly explained, for us impossible; and the issue is whether the present tariff is perfect, or defective and unjust.*

I believe it to be, in some important respects, defective and unjust.

We expressed our views last session in four motions, which declare that articles of such prime necessity as fuel and breadstuffs should be free; that the sugar duties should be so adjusted as to relieve the consumer from some of the enormous extra price he is now liable to pay to a few refiners; that the exorbitant and unequal duties on the lower grades of cottons and woollens should be so changed as to make them fairer to the masses, who now pay on the cheapest goods taxes about twice as great in proportion as those which the rich pay on the finest goods; and that the duties on such materials as iron, which is in universal use, should be reduced, so as to enable the home manufacturer, to whom it is a raw material, to produce a cheaper article for the benefit of his home consumer, and the encouragement of his foreign trade.

I believe that by changes of the character I have indicated monopoly and extravagant prices would be checked, a greater measure of fair play and justice to all classes would be secured, and the burden of taxation would be better adjusted to the capacity of the people who are to pay. Depend upon it, a day will come when by sharp and bitter experience we shall learn the truth; and many who even now applaud will then condemn these particular incidents of the tariff.

My reference there to the fiscal and financial limitations of our condition has increased force to-day, for since that time enormous sums have been added to the public debt; enormous sums have been added to the annual charge; and notwithstanding the great taxation,

## A LARGER DEFICIT THAN WE HAVE EVER KNOWN

since Confederation has signalized the last financial year. *Therefore the execution even of those measures of readjustment which I suggested in that address, and which we had proposed in Parliament in the preceding session, would be found much more difficult to-day by reason of the changed condition of affairs.* We have no longer a large surplus to dispose of—we have a large deficit and a greatly increased scale of expenditure to meet. And it is clearer than ever that a very high scale of taxation must be retained, AND THAT MANUFACTURERS HAVE NOTHING TO FEAR. I then declared that any readjustment should be effected with due regard to the legitimate interests of all concerned. In that phrase, “all concerned,” I hope no one will object to my including, as I do, the general public. (Cheers.) In any readjustment I maintain that we should look especially to such reduction of expenditure as may allow of a reduction of taxation, to the lightening of sectional taxes, to the lightening of taxes upon the prime necessities of life, and upon the raw materials of manufacture, to a more equitable arrangement of the taxes which now

## BEAR UNFAIRLY UPON THE POOR

as compared with the rich, to a taxation of luxuries just so high as will not thwart our object by greatly checking consumption, to the curbing of monopolies of production in cases where, by combination or otherwise, the tariff allows an undue and exorbitant profit to be exacted from consumers, and to the effort—a most important point—to promote reciprocal trade with our neighbours to the south. (Great applause.) That is a modest programme, you may say, but I believe it to be an extensive programme, representing the full measure practicable of attainment, and which can be fulfilled only by much expenditure of time and thought, after full investigation, careful inquiry, and ample consideration of details and of the bearing of each proposal, with the advantage of all those materials for forming a judgment on details, which are available only to men in office. (Cheers.) As to

## THE CONDITION OF THE OPERATIVE,

Sir John Macdonald's declaration in his recent speech was that, owing to his tariff policy, there is now employment for everybody, and that the Dominion is at this moment one of the most prosperous, if not the most prosperous country on the face of the globe. That condition I would be glad to admit, if I believed it. I regret to be obliged to dispute it. But I dispute the alleged cause as well, and I



maintain that *tariffs cannot permanently raise wages*. (Loud applause.) I want you to compare together the conditions in old countries, similarly circumstanced, each with dense populations, with accumulated capital, with great inequalities of life. Compare together England, without a tariff, and the continental countries of Europe, which are highly tariffed, and I maintain that it is beyond the possibility of dispute that the English operative has shorter hours, greater security for life, limb, and health, higher wages, cheaper supplies, and a condition, on the whole, greatly superior to that enjoyed by the operatives in any of the highly tariffed countries of the continent of Europe. (Loud and prolonged applause.) Is it the tariff regulations that have made the difference? If so, then they work the wrong way, according to the devotees of tariffs. (Renewed applause.) As to the United States, some of the most eminent statesmen of that country have declared that the longer hours, the severer toil, the greater intelligence of the operative, and the higher prices of some of his supplies, equalize his nominal reward with that of England. It is certain that these considerations go very far to do so; and the difference, whatever it may be, is diminishing year by year.

#### . TO WHAT IS THAT DIFFERENCE DUE ?

It is due, not to the tariff, but to differences of condition as between new and sparsely settled countries, with vast expanses of vacant fertile soil open to settlement, and old densely populated countries in which there is no such mainspring of prosperity. But I will describe those conditions and their results, not in my own words, but in the authentic language of the Canadian Government Guide Book to immigrants for the present year, 1886. The Government says :—

High wages are incident to the rapid development of wealth in a new country of immense extent, and they will probably for a long time continue to be high; at the same time it must be borne in mind that a new community may be, owing to the attractions of higher wages, subject to a glut, as has, in fact, happened, that is, there is, of course, a limit to which any particular branch of industry might, at a given time, call for workmen. But there is practically no limit to the masses of men which the Canadian North-West can absorb, the territory being about as large as the whole of Europe, with

#### ILLIMITABLE RESOURCES TO DEVELOP.

The rate of wages paid in such conditions has naturally relation to what may be earned by a man who takes up 160 acres of immigrant lands, for the plain reason that if a man is sure to make as much from the ready resource which is always open to him—of taking up land—he will not work for wages at a very great disadvantage. (Cheers.)

There is the statement of the Government itself, showing the condition of things in a new country with an illimitable extent of free and fertile lands, as compared with the condition in the British Isles. Now, mark the reasoning. They do not tell the English, Irish, or Scotch workingman that it is the Canadian tariff that makes Canadian wages high, for they know he would not believe it. They know that he knows better, whatever they may think the Canadian operative

#### CAN BE GULLED INTO BELIEVING,

and they tell the Islander the truth. (Cheers.) They give the true reason, and I ask you to mark that reason—not only as destructive of those other reasons which they reserve for the Canadian elector, but also because it gives to the operatives of the city of Toronto a direct and intimate pecuniary connection with, and interest in the prosperity of the North-West. *North-West misgovernment, a check to North-West progress, anything which may prevent the best results accruing to the settler on its free and fertile lands will, you perceive, have a directly disadvantageous effect upon the value of labour all over the country.* (Loud cheers.) How does the matter work in its other aspects? As things are at present the manufacturer takes all he can get out of the consumer, and gives as much as he must, or as he thinks right, to the operative. If more be demanded he looks elsewhere for help. *There is no tariff against the import of labour.* (Loud and prolonged cheering.) If the employer will not pay the rate of wages in the United States,

#### THE MECHANIC GOES OVER THERE;

and under the circumstances of both countries the rate of wages in the United States regulates the rate in Canada. Sir Leonard Tilley stated this in terms a little while ago in the House of Commons, using this language:—

The prices paid for labour in the United States must regulate the price of labour in Canada, because if the wages are not about equal the operatives will soon pass over the line.

Now, I have said there is no tariff on labour; there is no protection to labour. But that is not all.

#### THERE IS A PREMIUM AGAINST LABOUR.

There is, out of the taxes paid by labour, an enormous expenditure upon immigration. On this vital point, in his discussion of the interests of the working classes, Sir John Macdonald, by an ex-

traordinary lapse of memory, forgot to speak. (Loud applause and laughter.) We Liberals have pointed out for years that in Old Canada, only farmers should really be encouraged to come. As to domestic servants, the conditions of service must be modified, the relations of the race practically recognized, and

#### GREATER MUTUAL INTEREST AND RESPECT

shown between employer and employed ; else our people shun the condition of domestic service. (Applause.) And the importation of servants helps not so much, after all ; for many of them in a short time go across the lines. As to agricultural labour, the improvements in agricultural machinery, specially the invention of the self-binder, have largely checked the harvest demand, fortunately for the agriculturist, because the low rates he receives for his produce render it very important to him to save the cost of harvest labour ; and fortunately, also, for all, because, while there existed an enormous temporary demand for the short period of harvest, it followed that the over-plus, after the harvest was over, drifted into the towns and embarrassed and degraded the general condition of the labour market throughout the country. (Cheers.) Now, this immigration expenditure is

#### A SINK OF JOBBERY

—cheers—but so far as it is effective for its designed purpose, so far as the money is not thrown away or

#### HANDED OVER TO PARTY NEWSPAPERS

at fourteen prices for printing—(renewed cheers)—it tends to degrade labour. In the result Canadians are displaced by the immigrant, or the immigrant reaches the United States *via* Canada. I do not say that this is true in all cases, but it is true in too many cases, and the figures of population, from whatever source we draw them, sufficiently establish it. The Government system, has worked in practice, whatever they may say as to their intentions and instructions, so as to bring in not merely agricultural, but also general labour. (Loud cheers.) That is quite certain from what we know of those who come in under assisted passages. The Government denies most strenuously that it ever encourages or assists any other than the domestic servant or the agricultural labourer ; but I turn again to the Government Guide Book for 1886, and I find that in speaking of the Province of Ontario

## THE FOLLOWING STATEMENT IS GIVEN

as to the resources of the Province and the demand for labour:—

But as well as wanting men to clear its forests and cultivate its soil, it requires men to build its houses, to make furniture and household goods, and to open up communication from one part of the country to another by the construction of roads and railways.

It is further to be stated, in this connection, that Ontario is rapidly becoming a manufacturing country. The leading industries are: Works for making all kinds of agricultural implements in iron and wood, waggons, carriages, railroad rolling stock (including locomotives), cotton factories, woollen factories, tanneries, furniture factories, flax works, ordinary iron and hardware works, paper factories, soap works, woodenware, etc. The bountiful water supply in Ontario is used in these manufactures, as is also steam, for motive power.

There is a very great demand for female labour for domestic service, both in towns and country; also for work in some of the factories; also a demand for dressmakers and seamstresses, all of whom obtain good wages in Ontario.

So much as to the encouragement of general and operative labour. Now, with reference to the vexed

## QUESTION OF ASSISTED PASSAGES,

I find in this same Guide Book for 1886 this statement:—

It may be here particularly pointed out, however, that the most favourable rates of assisted passages are offered to female domestic servants and families of agricultural labourers. ASSISTED PASSAGES ARE, HOWEVER, AFFORDED TO OTHER LABOURERS.

(Cheers.) So that I find the direct statement in the Government Guide Book, to the people whom they are seeking to induce to come to Canada, that assisted passages are offered to others than the agricultural labourer and the domestic servant. (Loud applause.) My belief is that we should confine ourselves to circulating the facts of the true condition of the older Provinces, and their attractions to the farmer; that

## WE SHOULD ABOLISH THE ASSISTED PASSAGES;

that we should abolish the jobbery—(great cheering)—that we should cut down vastly the whole expenditure; and that we should leave the rest of the work to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, which we were told would relieve us of this business when the contract was let; and we would thus follow, though still more active than they, the methods adopted in the United States with reference to immigration. So much with reference to the important subject of Government expenditure on immigration, upon which Sir John Macdonald unfortunately forgot to touch. Now, recurring to

## THE TARIFF IN ANOTHER ASPECT,

I maintain that it has produced disaster to several important industries, and great consequent injury to the cause of labour. Unduly high protection, while the demand exceeded the supply, gave inordinately high profits, for example, in cotton, in sugar, and in certain descriptions of woollen goods. The public were heavily charged, and a few individuals were greatly enriched. (Applause.) Others wished to share the golden stream. Capital was sunk; mechanics were brought in from abroad; they were brought away from other occupations at home. Production was increased; and then came quickly, in our country of limited demand, the following stages: those of glut, of lower prices, of short hours, of lower wages, of closed factories and discharged hands, of general distress, and of demoralization of trade. Regularity of employment—which is the most important thing for the comfort of those who depend upon their daily work—was for the time destroyed. (Applause.) Now there is some revival, and I observe the First Minister has given his cause for that revival in his speech. He says:—

There was only one thing to be dreaded in introducing that policy, namely, that it might lead to over-production, and in consequence there would be great depression and insolvency. This was the case with regard to the cotton industry. The cotton manufacturers were so successful in their factories that in all parts of Canada the people rushed into the manufacture of cotton, the consequence being that more of the article was produced than was consumed. A REMEDY FOR THAT HAS BEEN FOUND, HOWEVER, IN THE BUILDING OF THE CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY.

(Loud cheers and laughter.) No! Not so! The remedy they have found has been in combination, in an

## AGREEMENT AMONG THE MANUFACTURERS

to advance prices, and perhaps to limit production, and so we are all called upon by a rapid rise, nay, by several rapid rises, of prices, to contribute to pay dividends on millions of capital needlessly expended in order to create a power of production in excess of the consuming power of the country. It is clear now that home competition in this and in other cases cannot be depended on to keep down prices; and the only safeguard, both for the manufacturers themselves, who have witnessed in these instances the disastrous results of high protection, and for the general public, who, in the early stage of inadequate supply, and again in the present stage of iron-clad combination, are called upon to submit to the full burden imposed by the tariff, is to take care that the tariff is

## NOT SO INORDINATELY HIGH

that the monopolist, whether he is such by virtue of there being no other manufacturer, or by virtue of a combination, shall have it in his power to take too much out of the general public. (Loud applause.) A great deal we must allow him to take, but the rates (as I have pointed out on former occasions), which this tariff in some industries allows to be taken, are altogether excessive and inordinate. But, it is said that the prices of commodities have been comparatively low of late years, and that this is due to the tariff. The prices are low all over the world. (Loud applause.) The progress of invention, the progress of production, the progress of facilities for transportation, the increased area of cultivation are, to the great gain of humanity, yearly reducing the cost of the articles which are in daily use; and it is

## NO JUST COMPARISON AT ALL

to contrast our prices of to-day with our prices of a few years ago. (Loud applause.) If you want to know whether prices are low or high in Canada, your only test is to compare them with the prices of the day in the free or the lowest markets of the world, and then you will see really whether they are comparatively high or comparatively low. Now, make this comparison, and you find prices in several classes comparatively high, and that we are losing in many commodities much of the general gain to humanity by the general progress of the world. (Applause.) Take, for example, sugar. They boast of the low price of sugar. *Sugar is low here compared with its price here a few years ago, but it is inordinately high here compared with the price in England in the present year.* The price of the raw material has fallen enormously. We do not get anything approaching the full benefit of that reduction. We pay infinitely more than they do in England, or in bond at New York. A large part of the excess is paid into the treasury, I frankly admit. A larger sum than I like to see levied on sugar. But a very large part of the excess over the foreign prices, a part approximating on the consumption of the year to \$2,000,000 beyond what goes into the treasury, is paid by the people of Canada in effect to assist the refiners to carry on their business. (Loud and prolonged applause.) Now, I pause here, I cannot further this evening discuss this phase of the tariff. I call your attention for a moment to another point, that of the

## DIRECT BURDEN OF THE TAXATION.

There has been an enormous increase. I shall not give you figures to-night; there is no time. The rate has increased from forty to



fifty per cent. The volume of the taxes received has increased from fifty to sixty per cent., and the amount paid by the people into the treasury is estimated at about \$30 per head of every white family. That is the amount paid into the treasury, but the consumer, and especially the mechanic, who buys from the retailer in very small quantities, pays a very large advance over the amount paid into the treasury. The advance which the wholesale merchant charges the retailer, and the further advance which the retailer charges the consumer, are both, of course, as a rule made upon the duty as well as upon the other elements of the cost, and forty to fifty per cent. advance upon the duty, will represent the real burden upon the consumer. The cost, therefore, to the consumer must be from \$42 to \$45 per head of a family on the average. We in this Province believe, and I think rightly, that we

#### PAY MORE THAN THE AVERAGE.

I could wish that the taxes were levied just for once, not in greater quantity, but in a different way. *I could wish that they were for once levied directly; for if they were paid by you to a collector calling upon you, instead of being included in the cost of the goods you buy, you would apprehend the burden, you would scrutinize more earnestly than you do the items of the public expenditure which are the justification for the tax; you would realize how that taxation presses on the industries of the people.* The very interesting paper prepared by Mr. Blue, of the Ontario Bureau of Statistics, showed the condition of workingmen for last year as well as the averages of his correspondents' returns could indicate it. They were, however, averages of superior men, men who kept accounts of their household expenses, and these are men who do better than the general average, and therefore the general average would be

#### MUCH LESS FAVOURABLE

than these results. Yet the paper shows that, assuming the average family of the picked mechanic. at 4½, which is the number these figures seem to indicate, food cost \$216.42; fuel, \$40.53; rent, \$72.41; clothing, \$86.39; or a total of \$417.75, and the average earnings of the worker and his family are \$447.60, *leaving, for all the rest of his expenses, the sum of \$29.85*—for the doctor, for schooling, for books, for church, for charities, for pleasure, for all the amenities and some of the necessities of life, this paltry pittance of less than thirty dollars, without anything for reserve, without anything for a rainy day, without anything for the inevitable period when youth and skill and health depart, to be re-

placed by weakness, infirmity, and old age. (Loud cheers.) This is the average condition

#### EVEN AMONG PICKED MEN

—miserable. And many among these had no surplus, and some were even deficient. I was told last year, when I discussed this subject in the light of the figures of that day, that I ignored the fact that the wages make the scale and that the scale eats up the wages. I did not ignore the fact. I recognize the fact, and I deplore the fact. (Loud applause.) *I say it is a fact of which we ought to be ashamed and a fact which we ought to endeavour to make a fact no longer at the earliest possible moment.* (Renewed applause.)

#### THE CONDITION OF THINGS IS WRONG,

if the wages are to make the actual, and that a low scale of living, and the scale is to eat up the whole of the wage. I AGREE WITH MR. JOSEPH CHAMBERLAIN, WHEN HE SAID, A YEAR OR SO AGO, THAT OUR NATURAL RIGHT IS NOT ONLY TO EXISTENCE, BUT TO THE FAIR ENJOYMENT OF IT. (Loud and prolonged cheering.) And the present state affords no such enjoyment, and no adequate provision for old age, sickness, or infirmity. I protest against the view that all is well. (Loud cheers.) All is not well. But see in the light of what I have just now told you, *how important a thing is the abstraction from these scanty earnings*, and this still more scanty margin, *of even \$40 for federal taxation*, or of even \$20, half that amount. (Hear, hear.) Some tax we must pay, but the tax which we were promised should not be increased has been enormously increased, has been recklessly increased, has been wantonly increased; has been, in the first instance, needlessly increased, and if now required, is required only because the Government was determined to spend up to the limit to which you allowed yourselves to be taxed; and, therefore, for the increase, and for the abstraction of what you might otherwise have added to this too scanty margin, I charge the Government of the day. But, apart from the question of the burden of taxation as cast upon as all,

#### I OBJECT TO THE CHARACTER

and the distribution of the taxation. Things are even worse than I have just described them. *Not only is the burden great, but the distribution of that burden is unjust.* One general system of taxation, I maintain, as I have long maintained, is unjust as between the richer and the poorer classes of the community. (Loud applause.) TAXATION GENERALLY SHOULD BEAR MORE

HEAVILY THAN IT DOES UPON CAPITAL, AND MORE LIGHTLY UPON LABOUR, MORE HEAVILY ON THE RICH, AND MORE LIGHTLY ON THE POOR. (Renewed applause.) Realized, fixed, and permanent capital from its nature can afford to contribute, and ought to contribute, more than fluctuating, temporary, and wearing out labour; and the rich man,

#### WITH A SURPLUS INCOME OF THOUSANDS.

should contribute more proportionately out of that income than the poor man out of that poverty which leaves him no more than a bare subsistence. It does not pinch the rich; it does not pinch capital; the rich man and capitalist, if you call upon him for somewhat heavier taxation, may have to see his yearly increase somewhat diminished; he may—though that is an extreme case—even have to give up an extra horse, or an extra ball, or an extra month at the seaside; but these are consequences not very serious. Life, even without those things, is very well worth living. But what to the rich man is nothing becomes a very serious question to the poor man. When you increase his taxes he has to consider which of those few things he has deemed up to that time necessities of life he shall deem a necessary of life no longer. Therefore, if we were attempting to lay direct taxes in Ontario, I should

#### STRONGLY FAVOR A SUCCESSION TAX,

under which realized capital upon its descent should pay a toll to the State, thus yielding at the period most convenient for all, some portion of the unearned increment. (Loud applause.) Therefore again, if we were attempting to lay an income tax here, *I should advocate a graduated tax* upon just such a scale as we might be able to fix without creating, what is the serious difficulty, too great temptation for the fraudulent evasion of that easily evaded tax. And, therefore, I maintain the justice of the exemption from our municipal income tax of the smaller incomes, and would gladly see the limit raised, so that the reasonable earnings of wage-earners should remain untouched. (Cheers.) On these general grounds it is that I think in the Dominion system of indirect taxation—a system which I cannot propose to change—the taxation should

#### BEAR MORE HEAVILY ON LUXURIES

as a means of remedying, if only partially, the existing injustice. You may call all this Socialism. I don't call it so; I call it nothing but justice and fair play. (Loud and prolonged applause.) Now the present system works just the other way. The system of specific duties upon goods of different values, weights and qualities

results in this—that the poor man is obliged to pay more, in proportion to the value of the cheap and coarse and heavy goods to which he must confine his purchases, than the rich man is called upon to pay for the fine and costly goods which he can afford to purchase. So that, instead of there being a proportion, there is a disproportion; and

THAT DISPROPORTION IS IN FAVOUR OF THE RICH AND AGAINST THE POOR.

This proposition as to the effect of specific duties was stated by Sir Leonard Tilley when he was Finance Minister, on the occasion of a visit to England, though it is repudiated a good deal in Canada. I have often demonstrated it by examples which I have no time to give to-night.

There is ANOTHER INJUSTICE in the distribution of the taxes, namely, the imposition of sectional taxes and of high taxes on prime necessities of life, as fuel and bread; and of raw materials of manufacture, as fuel again. (Cheers.) There is yet ANOTHER INJUSTICE in the raising of some taxes so high that it unduly fosters those monopolies in manufacture which, by combination or otherwise, are thus enabled to extract too great sums from the people. On the whole I cannot agree with those who say this tariff is perfect. I think I have indicated points in which it is seriously defective, and in which it ought to be amended. (Applause.) I alluded a moment ago to

MONOPOLIES FOSTERED BY TARIFFS.

There are other descriptions of monopolies which affect the masses of the community and the wages of labour—monopolies of transport, monopolies of land, and creations of fictitious capital and watered stock, clothed with great powers, enabling them to press upon the public and to lower largely, by the contributions they levy, the value of labour. Most railways are, to some extent, monopolies in respect of the non-competitive local points; nor, even where there is another railway, can you be sure how long there will be competition. As most of you are aware by experience, both of older and of recent date, combination is too likely to follow competition; and the effort then is to obtain enough from the public to compensate for the new capital invested or created. But it was reserved to Canada, just at the time when the question of the regulation of transport was becoming acute on this continent, just when it was plain to the great statesmen on the other side of the lines, and was even becoming clear to the people of England, that this question of the regulation of transport was a

most serious problem of the near future—it was reserved, I say, to Canada at this time to

#### CREATE THE GREATEST MONOPOLY

of all, and in all its features; transportation, public grants, land and privileges, absolute monopoly, and fictitious capital. (Loud applause.) Take the case of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. My quarrel is with the policy of the Government, which I denounce, and not with the Company, which obtained what it could from the Government. My quarrel with the Government is serious.

The corporation was created at the cost of the State, which is giving in connection with the whole scheme the equivalent of \$87,000,000 in cash, besides land and public resources, out of which other resources about \$11,000,000 have been realized already, and of which there are about 14,000,000 acres left to sell.

Besides this, there were free right of way and grounds, exemption from taxation, monopoly and numerous privileges of enormous value.

There was enough to build the road at a reasonable pace.

Then the Government authorized a loan of \$35,000,000, on which the traffic has to pay the interest.

Then the Government authorized the issue of \$65,000,000 of stock, now in the hands of the promoters and the public. But it was on the

#### WRETCHED STOCK-WATERING PLAN.

The Company received but \$29,500,000 for the \$65,000,000.

But this is not the worst. The Government authorized such arrangements as resulted in the retention out of the Company's resources, within a brief space, of about \$21,000,000 to pay and secure dividends.

So it has come to pass that of \$65,000,000 nominal stock there has gone into and remained in the road only \$8,500,000, about \$1 out of \$8!

A modest dividend of 6 per cent. on the nominal capital would absorb \$3,900,000 a year, or 46 per cent. on what is in the road.

So that for all time labour is to be

#### TAXED TO PAY DIVIDENDS

on this enormous block of nominal capital.

Necessarily North-West rates must in future be higher, and the prosperity of Canada at large be less, and the return of labour be diminished by this policy.

These great grants and privileges of themselves tended to monopoly, for how could private capital compete with them?

But all this was not enough.

The Government established an actual positive monopoly, by the prohibition for 20 years of roads running southward—a thing wholly unprecedented, and as indefensible as it was new.

Now, we proposed that Parliament should reserve the right to acquire the road on reasonable terms should the interest of the State in the future demand it, but in vain.

We proposed that the avenues of trade to the East and South should not be barred, but in vain.

We proposed that the clause of exemption from taxation, which reads thus:—

The Canadian Pacific Railway and all stations, station grounds, workshops, building yards and other property, rolling stock and appurtenances . . . and the capital stock of the Company shall be free for ever from taxation by the Dominion or by any Province hereafter to be established, or by any municipal corporation therein ; and the lands of the Company in the North-West Territory, until they are either sold or occupied, shall also be free from taxation for 20 years after the grant thereof from the Crown.

should be modified, but in vain.

We called attention to the fact that 25,000,000 acres of choice land were to be granted,

#### UNACCOMPANIED BY ANY CONDITION

that the agricultural lands should be open to actual settlers in suitable areas, and at fixed maximum prices, and we proposed a change in this sense, but this proposal also was rejected. Since that time the evil effects of the creation of large interests in lands without such conditions have been further evidenced. But notwithstanding when, in 1885, large further free grants were proposed in aid of railways in the North-West, and I moved that the agricultural lands should be opened to actual settlers in reasonable areas on conditions of settlement and at fixed maximum prices, my proposal was again rejected, and the evil results are now apparent. Again, when large grants were made of coal, agricultural and ranching lands to aid the construction of a coal railway, I pointed out that

#### UNLESS WE MADE SPECIAL PROVISION

as to the admission of other mines to the benefits of the road and took special powers as to tolls, a practical monopoly would result and evil would ensue. I proposed an amendment. I was told it was all nonsense, that there could be no difficulty. And I find only the other day an extract from the *Regina Leader*, a Conservative paper, in these terms:—



Sir Alexander Galt must be a greedy man. Here has he got a fine mine from the people of Canada, and he makes a portion of his benefactors along the line of railway, poor farmers—or tries to do this—pays \$3.50 per ton for coal which he is selling in Winnipeg for \$6.50. And why? Because we have not the competition here.

And what does the *Leader* advise?

We hope our people will adopt, as far as possible, Mr. Arkles' excellent suggestion to use timber.

(Loud laughter and applause.) There is the remedy proposed against a practical monopoly which was created unchecked, in spite of the efforts of the Liberal party. (Cheers.) Now in all these matters, whether they concerned the enormous grants to the C. P. Railway, or the creation of practical and actual monopolies, or the creation of great blocks of fictitious stock, or the tremendous exemptions from taxation, or the grants of land without conditions opening them to settlement—in all these matters I maintain that the Liberal party has been labouring for the people and against the monopolist, for the settler and against the speculator, for the masses and against the few; and I am convinced that the policy we advocated would have given you a more flourishing and better settled West, and a happy and more prosperous East than now obtains. (Loud cheers.) So much I have said with reference to the past and the present. And now I turn to what Sir John Macdonald had to say to the workingmen.

#### ON THE EVE OF AN ELECTION,

with reference to the future. I was not surprised when I looked at that portion of his speech and scrutinized its contents, that he had wasted so much time upon the sterile past. (Applause.) It was because he had so little to say for the future. What did he promise? A bureau of labour and statistics in the first place, and a royal commission of inquiry in the second place. As to the bureau of labour and statistics, that is a good thing. It should have been created long ago. (Applause.) We have had a bureau of statistics established in and for this Province, which has initiated the operations, and has been, and is doing, very good work. (Loud applause.) I suppose it is to be largely duplicated. I trust its operations are to be extended; and I do hope that the appointment made in connection with this Bureau will be of a man suitable for the position, for upon the appointment depends almost the whole practical value of the department. (Cheers.) I spoke my mind, and that of the Liberal party, as to the importance of the

## COLLECTION OF STATISTICAL INFORMATION

and the duty of the Government to attend to this matter a long time ago. In 1877, when I was a member of Mr. Mackenzie's Government, I said:—

I may say generally that it is unfortunate that Canada should be so imperfectly supplied with machinery for the collection of statistics on many other subjects of interest. My colleagues, in common with myself, are fully alive to that fact, and it is only the question of expense, which, in the present condition of the country, deters us from proposing the creation of that statistical machinery which every free community must feel to be material to intelligent, sound, and progressive legislation.

Therefore you will observe that we pointed in this direction nine years ago. Since that time—at all events since the year 1880—we have had an overflowing treasury, and, it is said, a flourishing condition of affairs; the income was there, at any rate, though created by an enormous taxation. And during all that time, no talk, no thought, no proposal of a bureau!

A DEFICIT COMES, AN ELECTION APPROACHES, AND STRAIGHTWAY  
THE BUREAU DAWNS UPON THE HORIZON.

(Cheers and laughter.) Then the other great proposal is of a Royal Commission. In 1873, Sir John Macdonald issued a Royal Commission, in order to obtain the whitewashing of political criminals from a great offence. And in 1886 he proposes to issue another Royal Commission, in order that he may lead the great political jury to which he is about to appeal to give a more favourable verdict than he might otherwise expect. (Laughter and cheers.) I do not object, for my part, to the issue of a Royal Commission. The problems which are referred to in this proposal have attracted the attention of the acutest minds and been the subject of most able disquisitions. The results are to be found in printed books, and if I may judge by the men named and

## THE RESULTS ACHIEVED BY FORMER COMMISSIONS

appointed by this Government in the professed interests of the working classes, if I am to judge by the work and results of the commissions issued to Mr. Blackeby and Mr. Lukes, I should not have very high hopes myself from the result of this Royal Commission. (Laughter and applause.) I agree that it is important to ascertain whether there be anything in our special conditions different from those of other countries in relation to these great problems, but I am inclined to doubt that either Mr. Blackeby or Mr. Lukes or anybody else who may be appointed, will find on

the general question much more than is to be found in the works showing the researches of the ablest labour reformers in the world. I was sorry, however, to observe that Sir John Macdonald, after promising a commission of inquiry, had no words of hope, no expressions of his own views, no suggestions of sympathy with the objects which are being aimed at by the working classes. (Applause.) *Now amongst the important practical improvements which I should wish to see would be that amongst our members of Parliament there should be some who from experience know, and from familiar intercourse, can realize what most of us have only learned from books and at second-hand.* (Cheers.) They would be useful in the halls of Parliament, both from their special and practical knowledge, which would enable them to take an important part in the deliberations of Parliament, and also because their presence in Parliament would give special assurance to the working classes of the presentation of their views in the best light and from their own standpoint. (Renewed cheering.) I hope to see a genuine Liberal of this stamp,

#### I CARE NOT WHAT HIS PARTY NAME MAY BE,

so that he be a genuine Liberal advocating our views, sent to Parliament from Toronto at an early day. (Loud and prolonged applause.) I do not wish to make odious comparisons, but I do not think it would take very long to convince you that you might better your representation—(cheers and laughter)—and that you could find in the ranks of labour many a man who would put to the blush—if any blushes they have left—a good many more pretentious members of Parliament. (Hear, hear, and great applause.) I cannot say for myself that I expect to see all the plans of labour reformers early, or some of them ever, incorporated in the statute book; but there is much in these proposals with which I have long sympathized. I rejoice greatly to observe *the wise and conservative spirit in which, on many occasions, the most prominent figure in the ranks of labour has spoken*, and used his great influence over his fellow-men. (Cheers.) He has recognized the evils incident to the strike and the boycott. He has counselled prudence, moderation, self-restraint, and conciliation along with firmness. He has advised the wise and restrained use of the power of combination, which, if abused, may be so hurtful, and if wisely used has been and must be so helpful to the cause of labour. On the whole he is a man of whom, I think, not merely the class to which he belongs, but the whole English-speaking community, may well be proud. (Great applause.) Now a word I have to say as to the

## RELATIONS OF LABOUR AND CAPITAL,

which is one of the things referred to as to be enquired into by this commission. I am sorry there was no expression of opinion from the First Minister on that point. I, for my part, do not object, on the contrary, I heartily approve of the accumulation which is the result of honest toil and superior energy and brain power. (Applause.) The power to rise is a great incentive to industry, frugality, and the orderly advance of humanity. It keeps us at work. But it should not be impaired by artificial advantages given to the few, and to capital; by watered stocks and unjust profits; by toll and tribute levied under law for the benefit of the unreal and fictitious capital; by speculative holdings of the public domain; by too burdensome a load of taxation, and by unjustly distributed taxation. I want to see this power to rise left and kept as unimpaired as possible. The problem of the division between capital and labour of the fruits of their co-operation is a most serious one. That division has

## NOT BEEN JUST IN THE PAST

—(cheers)—and conflicts of a grievous character have arisen in the effort to readjust it. Combinations between employers, combinations between workmen, strikes by the workmen, lock-outs by the employers—a state of affairs resembling nothing but civil war!

## CAN SOME REMEDY BE FOUND FOR ALL THIS?

Surely we must try! It is the question of the day. (Great applause.) Now, I frankly confess to you that I believe the complete remedy is largely out of the pale of law. I believe it is largely to be found in the growth and in the exemplification in our daily lives of the Gospel precepts—"Love thy neighbour as thyself," and "Whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them." (Applause.) *If we believe these precepts to be realities, we must live them; and if they influenced our lives we should see fewer instances of manufacturers grinding the faces of employees, and of the general consuming public grinding the face of the merchant and distributor of production. A fair living rate would be deemed right; and to give or take more or less would be deemed wrong.* (Cheers.) We are, I hope, rising—too slowly and gradually, considering that this is the nineteenth century of the Christian era—to this view; and that circumstance must help us greatly in the adoption of the other practical, lawful, and conventional remedies which are suggested. *There is the remedy of industrial partnership and the remedy of*

*co-operation.* (Applause) These are two distinct plans, each having its own advantages and its own difficulties. I believe myself in the future of both, but I believe that each requires for its proper fulfilment a more elevated moral tone and a greater mutual confidence on the part of those concerned. Both have been tried very often, tried in various countries, tried with varying success; but tried with a great measure of success in several instances; and that fact proves the possibility of success in many more instances, if only the question be approached by both sides in the proper spirit. Industrial partnership is the natural first step, because at present you have capital and you have labour joined together, though in an unhappy sort of union, and this seems to be the suggestion for a fitter union between the two. If time allowed I would desire to give you

#### SOME SIGNAL INSTANCES

of the success of each of these plans. The great point to be reached is the creation of a practical and felt community of interest, the recognition of the right of labour to a share in the fruits produced by the joint action of labour and capital; and the adoption of means to gain that right. These plans must grow, and in them ultimately, I believe, will the conventional remedy be found. I would like to see them tried well and prudently here; and I would invite for them, if they should be tried, the active sympathy and co-operation of the consuming public towards establishments founded upon these principles, the success of which here would tend to the best interests of the world at large. (Applause.) But meantime the conflict goes on; and the immediate palliative for the avoidance of this kind of civil war to which I have referred is

#### ARBITRATION.

In that I have great faith. (Loud applause.) It involves partial recognition of the rights of labour. It tends to substitute reason and conciliation for force and violence. It has done great good and will do more. Yet its root is to be found, I believe, in its moral strength. We may be able by law to facilitate arbitration; we may even provide boards of arbitration; but we cannot, in most cases, hope to compel reference to arbitration, or obedience to an award. The real good will often vanish in such an effort, and the work must, therefore, be mainly voluntary. The strength of combination, the pressure of public opinion, the power of mutual good-will, and the energy of the forces which are making for righteousness, must be the main dependence for securing the submission to arbitration and the ratification of its results. I have

done. There is much more to be said upon these questions, but time fails me. Yet I cannot part from this subject of the condition and prospects of workingmen without saying that there is

#### ONE THING WE HAVE IN OUR OWN POWER,

and by which we can most sensibly ameliorate our condition, and that is by the surrender of the drinking habit. (Tremendous applause, renewed again and again) *I believe that no greater boon can be dispensed to the working man, his wife, and family, than that which he can give himself by becoming a total abstainer—* (renewed applause)—*and I tell you frankly that I should hope as much from the direct and indirect influences of temperance as from any other human agency, or from all combined, without it.* It would help all. And now I close. I have not sought to excite false hopes, or create glowing anticipations; nor have I endeavoured to unduly darken the picture. I have tried to speak the words of truth and soberness. I have told you what I believe to be in fact and in truth the condition of things as it exists, to what we have to look, and for what we have to hope. I pray you to think calmly over what I have said, and I ask that you may be guided to a sound judgment, and may act and vote according to the strength of the argument, and the justice of the cause. (Loud and prolonged cheering.)

## KNIGHTS OF LABOUR.

### Canada a Country of Labour—Protecting the Workers— Necessity for Factory Legislation.

Mr. Blake said at Welland, in response to addresses from the Liberal Association, the Knights of Labour, and the Young Men's Liberal Clubs:—Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, allow me before asking your attention to some other topics of public interest to return my thanks to the various organizations for these addresses. I receive with gratitude the assurance from the Reform Association of the County of Welland of the full confidence which they are pleased to repose in me. Here, as elsewhere, I must tell you that I cannot accept as deserved by me the flattering expressions of kindly confidence which have been showered upon



me in so many parts of the country. I am too conscious of my shortcomings as a public man to be able to receive them as deserved. I realize that your kindness has taken the will for the deed; that you believe I have endeavoured, as far as the poor measure of my strength and power allowed, to do my duty towards you in the station in which I have been placed; that you are willing to overlook my shortcomings, and to look rather upon my honest effort to do good according to my lights. And I can assure you that these expressions of confidence and affection will nerve me to endeavour in the future to be more deserving of the kindly feeling you entertain towards me than I can claim to be to-day. And now to you, sir, who read the address of Welland Assembly of the Knights of Labour, and to that Assembly, I have to express my thanks for the language of the address. I fully recognize the honourable and

#### DIGNIFIED POSITION OF HONEST LABOUR.

(Cheers.) I see that you have assumed a knightly title. In that respect I am rather in an unfortunate position. I was obliged from my view of public duty nearly ten years ago respectfully to decline the offer, altogether beyond my poor deserts, of the honourable rank of Knight Commander of the most distinguished Order of St. Michael and St. George—(Great applause)—and I understand that by the regulations of your body I am precluded as a lawyer—though, alas, a practising lawyer no longer—from the hope of ever attaining the much more to be coveted honour of being a Knight of Labour. (Laughter and cheers.) So between these two stools I have come to the ground—(laughter)—and I suppose I must content myself with being what, after all, I have ever desired to remain, plain Edward Blake to the end of the chapter. (Loud and prolonged cheering.) I fully recognize the truth of what has been said as to the importance to the state of the condition of the toiling masses. If there be a country in the world in which the importance of labour must be fully recognized it is this country. Because, happily, most happily for us,

#### WE ARE A COUNTRY OF LABOUR.

(Applause.) There are but an insignificant few amongst us who do not earn their bread by their daily toil. We are also fortunate in this respect that capital and labour in our country are to a great extent in the same hands, for we have a large agricultural community, still, though not to the extent it once was, not to the extent I could wish it to continue, made up of freehold proprietors of the farms on which they live, the capitalist and the labourer being in these cases happily the same. Nor are those among us

who labour altogether debarred from the hope of bettering their condition and becoming capitalists, though, as I have pointed out elsewhere, *the conditions are not what they ought to be*. I will add that in my investigations of my own country and my inquiries respecting others, *I have ever looked with the utmost anxiety to the condition of those who stood in the ranks of skilled and unskilled labour*, satisfied that if these were in a reasonably prosperous condition, if these enjoyed reasonable hours, fair pay, decent subsistence, a moderate enjoyment of existence, an opportunity to rise, a chance to lay by something for a rainy day and for the time of old age, sickness, and infirmity—satisfied, I say, that, if this was, as it ought to be, the condition of the labouring classes, the condition of those who were still better off could not call for very strong sympathy or compassion. (Applause.) Now, I do not enter at large to-day into the general question of labour legislation, and my relation to that question, because I have lately spoken on most of its aspects, having indeed left untouched one important topic only, upon which I shall say a few words. I refer to the subject of

#### FACTORY LEGISLATION.

(Applause.) In Sir John Macdonald's Ottawa speech, his manifesto to the labouring classes, he made, as I have pointed out elsewhere, a great many extraordinary lapses; and amongst his omissions was this—that he forgot to say anything at all about Dominion factory legislation. (Applause and laughter. There was a great flourish of trumpets in the session of 1883, and another in the session of 1884, with reference to the good intentions of the Government on this subject, and these good intentions were exemplified by the introduction in each of these sessions of a bill. But

#### THOSE BILLS HAVE BEEN DROPPED.

We have heard no more of them. (Applause.) They never were pressed, and the Government has now even ceased to adorn the Speech from the Throne with any suggestion of Dominion factory legislation. (Renewed applause.) Presumably this is because they found out they were wrong in this attempt to legislate at all. (Hear, hear.) That is the only explanation I can suggest to you; because if they think still they have the power to legislate, having declared it was expedient to exercise that power, having gone so far as even to introduce bills in '83 and '84, they must stand self-condemned for not having legislated in the succeeding sessions of '85 and '86. (Loud cheers.) I therefore assume that they have now found out that they had not the power to do what they professed to be able to do—what they promised they would do. If

so, it only furnishes another instance of the abortive efforts at centralization, the efforts to arrogate to themselves powers which did not belong to them, which have distinguished this Administration, and another instance of a constitutional lawyer mistaken—(cheers)—of a position abandoned, a promise unkept, a pledge unredeemed, and a people fooled and betrayed. (Loud and prolonged cheering.) Now, these bills, when they came before us, I analyzed, as was my duty, with care, and I found them far inferior in their character to what my wishes would have made. I found them inferior with reference to the powers of inspection, and the classes of factories to be inspected, and the provisions for health and safety which they prescribed; and also inferior in another most important respect—in reference to the restrictions and regulations as to the

#### EMPLOYMENT OF CHILDREN

and young persons. (Loud applause.) I prepared, in anticipation of the discussion, numerous amendments—between thirty and forty, I believe—intended to bring the bill more into accord with modern notions on these questions, but the bill was dropped without a word, and there was no opportunity to move these amendments. I would direct the attention, not merely of mechanics, but also of the general community, to the question of the employment of children and very young persons in factories. I have a very strong belief that children ought largely to be kept out of factories. (Loud applause.) I do not propose indiscriminately to abolish all child labour in factories; but I think

#### THE EMPLOYMENT SHOULD BE GUARDED AND CHECKED;

and, when allowed, I believe children ought only to be admitted as half-timers, that is, allowed to work for half a day only with special provision for school attendance during the remaining hours, so that we may take care first that their physical strength and growth is not hurt by the prolonged confinement and labour of the factory, and secondly that their mental growth and development is duly fostered in the schools. (Applause.) The same observation, at any rate, as to the physical structure, and to some extent as to the mental development, applies to the employment in factories of very young persons, though past the age of childhood, especially of young women. The future of our race may be injured, and the state of labour in important respects degraded, by the too frequent, too prolonged, too sedulous employment of children and young persons in factories. (Hear, hear.) I heard with pain a statement made in the House of Commons, not very long ago. A member was pointing to the school attendance in Nova

Scotia, and arguing from its relative smallness that the population was not increasing as it should. The answer of a member on the Conservative side was, "Don't you understand how that small attendance comes about? The children haven't time to go to school now; they are employed in the factories." If that were so it was not a thing on which to congratulate the people of Canada. (Loud cheers.) As this address says, it is

TO THE EDUCATION OF THE MASSES WE MUST LOOK FOR PROGRESS;

and a system which impedes the education of the children, in order to employ them in factories, is not a thing which I, as a Canadian, can desire or approve. (Loud applause.) For a great many years Old England led the van in this subject of factory legislation. For more than eighty years they have been engaged in such legislation, from time to time altering, amending, and enlarging their laws, as experience pointed out the way, and they have done great things, no doubt, for the operative, for the child, and for the young person employed in the factory; but I am bound to say also that in late years England itself has been left rather in the back ground in some respects, and that in some of the continental countries, with reference to the employment of children, the education of children, and with reference, also, to the technical education of mechanics, advances have taken place which more than parallel the advances of England. I maintain that in any factory legislation we may devise here, we ought to look to that country which may stand in the forefront on this question, to follow the example of that land, whichever it may be, that has the best laws on the subject, and to legislate according to that clearer light, and by the assistance of that more advanced experience, rather than in a comparatively retrograde or halting manner. (Loud applause.) I turn to one other point before I pass from this address. I observe that Mr. White, at Owen Sound the other day, yielded once more to the fatal pressure of those political exigencies—(loud applause and laughter)—which have so often caused him to succumb before, and invented a policy for me, arguing that I had, as a policy for the Dominion, suggested a succession tax and a graduated income tax. Pray remember that this was

ONLY MR. WHITE;

and give it just that amount of attention to which his avowed standard of political morality in such matters entitles it. I expressly said that I could not propose a change in our indirect system of taxation for the Dominion. My suggestion was in terms confined to the Province of Ontario, where, if taxation is ever required, it must be direct. And even for Ontario, I suggested it.

only in case we were about to lay direct taxes. If we were about, in this Province, to lay a direct tax, I thought and think a succession tax the best. If we were about, in this Province, to lay an income tax, I thought and think a graduated tax just; and, as to our municipal income tax, I thought and think an extension of the existing exemption ought to be made. But as to the Dominion

#### I MADE NO SUGGESTION OF DIRECT TAXATION.

I declared that I could not propose a change in the system of indirect taxation. I have no idea of any such change. But I did propose certain changes in the details of our indirect system, for example in some specific duties, in the taxes on prime necessities, and so on, with a view to a more equitable distribution of the burdens as between rich and poor, as you will see in my speech, a speech no honest or candid disputant could read without agreeing in this interpretation. My misfortune is that these are not honest or candid disputants. (Applause.) I am ready, as I have shown by my past public course, to favour all fair and just measures towards the improvement of the condition of the working masses of the community, believing that upon that improvement largely depend the elevation and prosperity of all. (Loud and prolonged applause.)

---

## FAIR LAWS FOR LABOUR.

---

### SIR JOHN MACDONALD'S MEMORY PLAYS HIM FALSE.

---

#### LIBERAL LEGISLATION IN FAVOUR OF LABOUR.

---

#### OBJECTIONS BY TORIES—CONTRACT PRISON LABOUR—THE CHINESE ENCOURAGEMENT POLICY.

---

Hon. EDWARD BLAKE, in the course of his speech at Belleville, said:—I wish to say a few words on some points of Sir John Macdonald's Ottawa speech to the working classes; I spoke on some of the questions lately in Toronto. Of those which remain most refer to the past, and some in fact to the rather remote past,

and I confess to you that in the present pressure of urgent political topics, which ought to engross our attention, it is unwillingly that I take time to deal with these remote questions. I am bound to do so, however, because I believe the statements made should not go unanswered, and because I believe them to be very inaccurate indeed, and far from just representations of the actual facts. Sir John began by a very ancient reference—which has stood him in good stead for many long years—to the incidents connected with the printers' trouble in 1872; and on

#### THIS OLD STORY

he based one of his main arguments in support of his claim to the confidence and support of the workingmen. Sir John Macdonald said:—

They were, however, in 1872, horrified to find the then leader of the Liberal party in Canada putting in force in Toronto the obsolete and oppressive laws which ought to have been repealed a century ago. All would remember the general feeling of horror and disgust that prevailed when it was announced that 24 men had been arrested by warrant in Toronto because, forsooth, they had ventured to form a trade association, and had resolved to carry the principles of their Union into effect. At a meeting of employers, the then leader of the Grit party, the editor of the *Globe*, urged the masters to have no dealings whatever with Union men, and to hire none but those who would sign a document to the effect that they did not belong to any labour organization, and he trusted that in this way those who had shown a rebellious spirit against their employers would be

#### DRIVEN OUT OF THE COUNTRY.

At that time he (Sir John) happened to be Minister of Justice and Attorney-General, and in his capacity of Minister of Justice he advised the representative of the Sovereign, to at once release those printers and allow them to walk out once more as free men. (Cheers.) More than that, he at once introduced a bill into Parliament repealing those obsolete statutes, wiping them off the statute book as a disgrace to our present state of civilization, and introduced and carried through Parliament a law establishing Trades Unions and confirming them in their previous proceedings, and under that Act, which is now almost without any modification, the Trades Unions of Canada can assemble and act together in concert, and protect and advance their own interests against any combination of employers of labour, in case capital should become an oppressor of labouring men.

I am very sorry that it has unfortunately happened that Sir John's memory has repeatedly played him false in the course of this statement. In the first place, Mr. Brown, to whom he referred, was not then the leader of the Liberal party. He had not been its leader for many years. He had been out of Parliament for five years, and was not seeking re-election. He was a private member of the party, engaged in managing his great newspaper. Mr. Mackenzie, who can boast that he graduated from the stone-

mason's chisel to the position of Prime Minister of Canada—(Cheers)—was then the leader of the Liberal party. But it suited Sir John Macdonald's purpose for the moment to strike at the Liberal party through Mr. Brown by describing him as occupying a position which he did not occupy, and his memory helped his end. Sir John Macdonald altogether forgot, extraordinary to say, that at that date all but one, or, at the most two, of the printing offices in Toronto agreed conditionally to employ no Union men and, so far, acted with Mr. Brown. I have here the published declaration and agreement, from which I will read the signatures:—

Geo. Brown, *Globe Printing Co.*  
 J. Ross Robertson, *Daily Telegraph.*  
 James Moylan, *Canadian Freeman.*  
 J. B. Cook, *Express.*  
 E. R. Stimson, *Church Herald.*  
 S. Rose, *Christian Guardian.*  
 W. H. Flint, *Pure Gold.*  
 Patrick Boyle, *Irish Canadian.*  
 Copp, Clark & Co.

Dudley & Burns.  
 McLeish & Co.  
 Bell & Co.  
 Hunter, Rose & Co.  
 Rowsell & Hutchinson.  
 P. H. Stewart.  
 George C. Patterson.  
 M. J. Grand.

So this was not so far the resistance of one single man. It may have been wrong, but all these persons—men on both sides of politics—agreed to one course, and all must submit to one judgment. Sir John Macdonald also forgot—and this is still more singular—the action of the *Mail* newspaper at the very late date of 1884, not so long ago as 1872, when our notions were less fair and enlightened than in 1884. In 1884

#### THE "MAIL" PREPARED A DOCUMENT

which it required every one of those who were within the scope of its power to sign, declaring that he did not belong and would not belong to any union organization, a document which remained in force for a considerable time, but has lately, I am glad to believe, been modified. (Applause.) He forgot, too, the action of his own colleague, Mr. Frank Smith, only a few months ago, in this very year, 1886, when he required the employes of the corporation, of which he is president, controller and principal proprietor, the Toronto Street Railway Company, to agree not to belong to any union; and his subsequent conduct, when he called them in a very public place by a very opprobrious name. (Cheers.) He forgot all these things of course, for if he had remembered them he would have been silent, and would not have been ungenerous enough to bring up the error in judgment and action which in my judgment Mr. Brown, now six years dead, committed so long ago as 1872; because it is clear, from the case to which I refer, and from the whole facts, that this error cannot serve the Conservative



as against the Liberal party. (Loud applause.) I say it was an error. I think so now; I thought so then; and I declined at the time to take any part in the proceedings against the printers.

BUT LET US DO JUSTICE BETWEEN HIM WHO IS DEAD AND HIS ACCUSER, WHO STILL LIVES.

(Loud applause.) Mr. Brown used and enforced the laws of his country as he found them. Sir John Macdonald condemns him for it, because, as he says, those laws were obsolete, oppressive, and a disgrace to civilization, and should have been repealed a century before. I hold guiltier the Minister who was responsible for the law continuing upon the statute book unrepealed and unamended, than the private citizen, who, finding it there, thought fit to use it. It was there to use. The accuser is himself responsible for the law being there at that time. (Cheers.) It is he who is the author of the "oppression" and "disgrace;" it was his neglect that allowed it. (Renewed cheers.) If he had done his duty the law would not have been there to be used by any man. For twenty or thirty years before, Sir John Macdonald had occupied almost continuously a place of power and responsibility. He was always in a leading position; for a large part of the time he was actually leader of the Government; and for a still larger part of the time he was Attorney-General or Minister of Justice, specially responsible for the criminal law of the country. (Loud cheers.) During all that time he left the law ready to be used by any one; and now he comes, six years after Mr. Brown is in his grave, and holds him up to the opprobrium and execration of his fellow-countrymen because he said:—Here is the law of the land; it is made to be used; and I will use it. Thus you see Sir John Macdonald claims credit for action when he ought to apologize for inaction. He asks for praise when he deserves blame. (Cheers.) Again he says he relieved the printers, and advised the Governor-General to release them and allow them to walk forth free men. That is, I believe, all a mistake. It is another lapse of memory. The printers were not, so far as I can find, confined in gaol at all. They were bailed; and they were bailed to appear for trial for their alleged offence. Sir John could not have freed them, therefore, had he tried, and I feel quite sure he didn't. (Laughter and applause.) I believe they were not freed by the Governor-General at all; I believed they were not freed on Sir John's advice at all. I believe it is all a trick of the memory. (Applause.) He legislated on this subject, he said; but he forgot to say that his law specially excluded all pending cases, and left these printers just where they were before, and this by the express words of the statute—(cheers)—so he did nothing that I can find, either by

executive or by legislative action, to relieve them. (Cheers and laughter.) He forgot also that his much-lauded amending law was so grossly defective, so inadequate to the occasion and the needs of the day, that I had to set it right in several important particulars in 1876.

HE STATES ALSO THAT HE THEN LEGISLATED SATISFACTORILY ON THE SUBJECT OF TRADES UNIONS.

I differ from this view. His law contained a provision for registration, which is opposed to the interests of the unions. (Cheers.) I come now to the action of the Liberal party. When these bills, of which Sir John Macdonald speaks, were brought before the House, only one member rose to oppose the legislation. That was Mr. Masson, since a member of Sir John Macdonald's Administration, and at the present moment Lieutenant-Governor of Quebec. But I do not hold the Conservative party responsible for this action of one of its members. The leader of the Liberal party, however, rose to support it. He said, in answer to Mr. Masson's objection, that "he saw nothing in the bill that could do harm, though he thought the clause requiring mechanics to register their trades unions was rather harsh and restrictive towards workingmen. He did not see what objection there was to the bill." So, you see, the leader of the Liberal party supported the legislation, but with Mr. Mackenzie's practical knowledge of these matters

HE WAS ABLE TO HIT THE BLOT,

to point out the objection to the registration clause which has injured the operation of the law. (Cheers.) In 1876 and 1877 I dealt, as Minister of Justice, with this class of subjects, including breaches of contract of service; and if I were to adopt Sir John's method of discussion, and impute to the Conservative party whatever some individual member may have said, I might point out that when I was repealing the laws making breaches of contracts of service criminal offences, I was opposed, for example, by Mr. Pope, who had been a Minister in the Conservative Government, who was recognized as one of the leaders of that party, and who is a member of the present Government, who thought it was a dreadful thing that he should not continue to have the power to put in gaol his farm labourers in case they broke their contracts of service. In the same sense I might refer to the attitude of Mr. Hillyard Cameron, and of Sir John Macdonald himself, during the debate on my bill for the amendment of the criminal law as to violence, threats, and molestation.

Let me read from the report:—

Hon. Mr. Cameron (Cardwell) said it was suggested that something further ought to be in the bill which was not in the English law—that was, with reference to threats of accusing of crime. There were two or three classes of crime which would naturally suggest themselves to his hon. friend, where the accusation would be as great an serious an intimidation as any threat of personal violence or injury to property. He suggested the bill should be changed to bring such offences within its scope. Sir John Macdonald called attention to a threat of this kind: "You must continue work in this place, or I will do you mischief." The injury was not described, but it was intimidation; it probably did not mean violence to person or property.

Hon. Mr. Blake—It must be one or the other.

Sir John Macdonald said a threat might be made to injure the reputation, which was not property—there might be charges which did not amount to personal violence or injury to property, but still would affect a man's character. He suggested that his hon. friend take this into consideration.

Hon. Mr. Blake said of course he would give the suggestions of his friends due consideration, but he thought that, as practical legislators, it was better for them to provide punishment for the offences named by law than attempt to conjure up different kinds of possible threats which were unknown in this country. Probably many of the cases to which reference had been made by his hon. friends would be met by the existing law. By legislating for that class of crimes the objection might be raised by a large number in the community to its being class legislation, and they ought to be careful in dealing with such matters. He would remind his hon. friends, while not interposing objections to their views, that agreeing thereto would be making a new law, the utility of which had not been demonstrated by experience or required by public necessity.

Then at the final stage:—

Hon. Mr. Blake said he had decided not to adopt the suggestions of his hon. friends from Kingston and Cardwell with respect to this clause. He entirely agreed with them as to the importance of preserving to the minority of any trade or occupation its liberties against an improper assertion of the so-called rights of the union or majority, and he would always be ready while he sat in this House to sustain any legislation that time might determine to be necessary for that purpose; but this House might be averse to enact special legislation, unless for a real and admitted evil. As far as he knew, there was no reason to apprehend that this clause would be inadequate.

That is the attitude these gentlemen took with regard to the legislation I was seeking to carry in favour of equal rights to all classes of the community, and for the abolition of that which it has always been the aim of Liberals to abolish—class legislation. (Loud applause.) Then Sir John Macdonald declared that he was opposed to contract

#### LABOUR IN PENITENTIARIES,

and took credit for its abolition. But he has forgotten again. He, I need not tell you, is the man who, for the longest period we know of, has been responsible for contract labour in the penitentiaries. He was Attorney-General or Minister of Justice, and

had control of the penitentiaries for ever so many years, and during that time he controlled the legislation and the contracts; he arranged for the contracts under which the convicts were employed, and he never began to cry out against the system so long as he was in power. But as soon as he got into Opposition he began to cry out. (Laughter.) When he came back to power we called upon him to carry out the abrogation of the system, and almost every year this call was repeated, but nothing was done. (Applause.) At length, only a little while ago, a new Penitentiaries Bill was brought down. It was introduced in the Senate by his Minister of Justice, passed in that House, and came down to the House of Commons. There was not a word in it about abolishing contract labour. (Cheers.) I recalled once more the professions they had made, and intimated my intention of taking action in the matter. Sir John Macdonald thereupon asked that the bill stand over, and when it was resumed, just at the last stage, he introduced the clause of which he now boasts. That clause is due, not to his goodwill or initiative, but to my pressure. (Cheers.) He now says that the amendment was delayed because there were existing contracts. It is not so; his memory has played him false again. That amendment actually saves all existing contracts—(cheers)—it is expressly declared not to come into operation until those contracts terminate. I cannot speak positively, but I am strongly of opinion that these contracts were terminable at the will of the Government long before. Now, my opinion is that prisoners ought not to be under the control of contractors, but under the control of the prison authorities. Prison discipline, the prisoners' good, and the good of the community call, I think, for that course. My opinion with reference to the work done in prisons is that it ought to be such as will train the prisoners to earn an honest living when released, but at the same time such as will interfere as little as possible with free labour. (Applause.) There is no useful work to which you can put prisoners but 'will interfere somewhat with free labour. When in control of this department I tried to carry out what seemed to me

#### THE MOST ADVANTAGEOUS PLAN,

and in this view I purchased from Sir John Macdonald himself a farm in the immediate neighbourhood of the penitentiary, in which, according to my plan, spade husbandry was to be carried on, an industry in which as many hands as possible should be employed, with as little assistance from machines as possible. We had too many idle hands. I wanted to do by hand the work ordinarily done by machinery. I thought this employment would give the

prisoners health and exercise, and would interfere as little as possible with free labour. (Cheers.) I am afraid the system since carried out has not been fully in accordance with my intentions; and since that time the Government has taken a vote for the erection of a flour mill in Kingston Penitentiary, so that they might interfere as little as possible with the miller—(laughter)—who, as you know, has under the N. P. been making great and undue profits. (Laughter.) Sir John Macdonald also claimed credit in connection with

#### THE CHINESE QUESTION.

He has put a tariff upon Chinamen as he has on almost everything else. (Laughter.) In 1872, when the Tories made the contract with British Columbia for the construction of the Canadian Pacific in ten years, I objected to that bargain on several grounds, and amongst others I said the road could not be completed within that time, except by Chinese labour, and I was abused from end to end of Canada for such a suggestion. They said I was advocating the use of Chinese labour in building the Canadian Pacific Railway—(cheers and laughter)—while my argument was that the bargain was objectionable because it practically involved for its execution the employment of Chinese labour. (Laughter.) Although I was abused for the statement, it was true. It is true that many thousands of Chinamen have been imported into British Columbia to build that railway within a period longer than the ten years at first proposed. (Cheers.) I have read a good deal on both sides of this controversy, and I have found much conflicting evidence. But some things seem established on the whole.

#### CHINAMEN DO NOT BECOME WHAT WE CALL SETTLERS.

They do not become real citizens of the country—(cheers)—they do not become Canadians; they do not intermingle with our people, they do not accept our civilization, and they carry their earnings away to their own country as soon as they have secured the pittance adequate for a livelihood there. Though they live amongst us they are not of us; they hold to their own special customs, and to habits of life and a scale of subsistence far below ours, and involving the degradation of white labour. (Cheers.) Thrift and providence are good things, but decency and the customs of modern civilization are essential to progress; and these are interfered with by the existing conditions of Chinese labour. If you consider men simply as machines, the Chinaman may be on the whole a cheaper machine than the Canadian, but I have never admitted that the labour of a man ought to be regarded exactly as that of a machine. (Cheers.) Other elements are involved. (Cheers.) Now,

there was only one Province, British Columbia, in which this question pressed upon the people as a practical grievance. And in that Province there was one time when it pressed with special force as a present and future danger, and that was during the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway. It was obvious that the influx of Chinamen would be greater while construction was going on than before its commencement, or than after completion, and that the trouble would be worst when the road was finished. But nothing was done to prevent the evil. The Government refused to act. They said that as soon as the road was built, and not before, something would be done. Something was then done. A tariff was laid upon Chinamen. But, as I stated to you, the evil had been intensified, the mischief was accomplished. I saw in a newspaper the other day a correspondence from British Columbia, saying that two large shiploads of Chinese had just left the Province, and that there was no employment there now owing to the completion of the railway. The trouble is not a present influx, but the present excess. That was exactly the state of things which any sensible man would have anticipated. I am not of opinion, judging by the information I have been able to get, that the existing law is working satisfactorily. I believe it is admitted by the Government itself that the administration of it can be improved. **MY VIEW WAS AND IS THAT THE PROHIBITION OF THE IMMIGRATION OF CHINAMEN IS THE ONLY LOGICAL OUTCOME OF THE OPINIONS AND PRINCIPLES UPON WHICH OUR PRESENT LAW IS BASED.** It was said by Government, in opposition to this, that there was danger, if such a step were taken, of conflict with the Chinese Government. I believe it is admitted that the Chinese Government discountenances the emigration of its citizens, and, if so, that Government could hardly be dissatisfied with any action of ours which would help them to carry out their policy. (Applause.) Yet, I have recognized that it is an important object not to give offence to a friendly nation, and as the Government stated positively that such a law would give offence, I felt it my duty, as a public man, not to embarrass the Government by insisting upon prohibition unless it should appear to be absolutely necessary, but rather to accept in silence the assurances of the Government, and to endeavour to work successfully the proposed legislation. (Applause.) My reward for this forbearance has been the misrepresentation of our attitude, and I have thus been led to state my opinions. (Loud cheers.)

# WORKINGMEN AND PARTIES.

## HON. EDWARD BLAKE ON QUESTIONS AFFECTING WAGE-WORKERS.

### **Capitalists Allowed to Profit by the Saving Banks—Necessity of Protecting the Saving Workingman—Tory Acceptance of Liberal Doctrines—Review of Important Acts affecting Labour.**

Hon. EDWARD BLAKE, speaking at Deseronto, touched upon the relations of the parties to labour questions. In the course of his speech he said:—

One thing I would like to add to what I said at Belleville, suggested by a gentleman who came on the platform at the close of my speech and said, "Why didn't you refer to the fact that the Government itself had dismissed employ es on the Intercolonial Railway because they were members of a labour organization." My reply was that I had forgotten it for the moment, but that it certainly was a notable instance of the kind I had already quoted. He said, "I, at any rate, remember it very well, I was one of the men discharged on that ground; and that is the reason I am here now instead of being down there." Fine champions these of the cause of labour! (Loud and prolonged applause.) I said I would certainly take care to remedy my omission, and now I have fulfilled my promise. (Laughter.) There are one or two points that remain to be alluded to in this connection. In his Ottawa speech Sir John Macdonald

#### CHARGED THE LIBERAL PARTY

with being opposed to the Government arrangements for encouraging the accumulation of the savings of the wage-earners, and particularly to the interest allowed wage-earners on deposits in the Government banks. That is an inaccurate statement of the facts. For my own part, I have always felt the deepest interest in schemes devised for promoting habits of thrift and providence amongst those who may be encouraged out of their daily earnings to make accumulations. I believe it to be the duty of public men to press upon those whom they may influence the obligation which rests upon them, in the period of strength and energy and skill, to endeavour to provide for the rainy day, for the period of old age, of infirmity, and sickness. And not



merely by exhortation should we encourage these habits, but by providing such public facilities as we can for the promotion of the great object. It is quite true, however, that a few years ago I did object, with some other members of the Liberal party, to one of the regulations governing these savings banks. This regulation allowed no less than \$3,000 to be deposited by a single individual upon the specially favourable terms which the Government gave as to interest and in other respects. And we knew that the provision, itself too liberal as to amount, was practically evaded by wealthy men, some depositing \$3,000 in their own name, \$3,000 in the wife's name, \$3,000 in a son's name, or \$3,000 in a daughter's name, and so on, thus securing

#### THE DEPOSIT OF A HANDSOME FORTUNE

at these special rates. I said, and I think it is the opinion of wage-earners generally, that it was not within the limit of reason to describe an arrangement by which \$3,000 or more was allowed to be deposited, as an arrangement for the benefit of wage-earners. (Applause.) I said that the maximum ought to be reduced to the reasonable sum which we might expect the wage-earner to accumulate. My own opinion is that when the sum accumulated approximates to a thousand dollars the best thing the owner can generally do is to become himself a homesteader, the owner of the home in which he and his family live. (Cheers.) But at any rate he has become in a modest way a capitalist. Now I was very much abused at that time for suggesting this limitation. It was said I was speaking against the interest of the wage-earner. As has often happened, however, after abusing me for a year or two for my suggestion, the Government has adopted that suggestion and has reduced the limit from what it was before to \$1,000. (Cheers.) So far from being opposed to favourable arrangements in the interests of the wage-earner I spoke upon that subject in 1885 thus:—

I am very glad to hear the hon. gentleman state that the P. O. Savings Banks are being extended throughout the country. There are many localities where there are no facilities for depositing savings but that which is given by these banks, and I am sure the House and the country will receive with gratification the announcement that the Government propose to extend the operation of an institution which has been, on the whole, extremely beneficial.

Again, in the same session, I moved for copies of all correspondence and petitions to the Postmaster-General, or any member of the Government, with reference to the adoption in Canada of a system to encourage small savings, similar to that brought in by the late Mr. Fawcett in England. And I said:—

Some time ago the British Government adopted, at the instance of the late Mr. Fawcett, a system which I think it is desirable to encourage in this country, for small savings in connection with the Post-office. The details of that plan were that a slip was handed out to any applicant which contained twelve compartments, and in each of these compartments the depositor was intended as he made savings enough to buy postage stamps, to put a stamp, and as soon as twelve of these were filled, amounting to a shilling, he was

#### ABLE TO DEPOSIT THAT AMOUNT

so that he was saved from the temptation, with reference to his small daily savings, of spending them and having them lost, and was permitted at once to buy a stamp, and then when a shilling was reached the nearest post-office received the list and he was credited with a shilling. I have one of these interesting slips here. Now it seems to me that if we adopted, with reference to our postage stamp currency, a similar system—perhaps by means of five cent or three cent stamps, and made an arrangement for as many as would make up a quarter, which is our usual small denomination of that kind, it would be extremely useful. I think every effort should be made to encourage a system of saving in those who have the least to save. The importance is not to be measured at all by the amount of the savings. A provident habit is that which is of the last consequence, and a provident habit should be stimulated amongst those who have but little to save, and in early life as a sure way of inducing habits of thrift and economy which will make better men, better citizens, and the country which is inhabited by them more prosperous. I have reason to believe that this system has been suggested for adoption to the Government some time ago, and if not, I think it is a matter which should be taken into consideration.

The Government objected on the score of expense; and I pointed out some fallacies in their arguments, and contended that the indirect advantages were to be considered, and should outweigh their objections. Now I attach the highest importance to this question of accumulation; **BUT I AM DESIROUS THAT THE SPECIAL ADVANTAGES WHICH ARE OFFERED BY THE GOVERNMENT OF THE COUNTRY, ADVANTAGES IN EXCESS OF THOSE THE BANKS CAN GRANT, SHOULD BE CONFINED TO THE CLASS OF *BONA FIDE* WAGE-EARNERS.** (Loud applause.) If you extend them to the capitalist, you practically arrange that capital shall be benefited at the expense of the public revenue, of which you yourselves contribute too large a proportion as it is. A great deal is said as to the prosperity of the country and of the wage-earning classes, for proof of which they point to the increase in the deposits. You will know yourselves how much there is in that argument; how much you have deposited in the savings banks within the last two years. There has been a large increase in the public deposits. I am glad to know that some portion of that increase has come from the wage-earners. I know that in some localities, circumstances have been such as to enable them to add a little to their accumulations, but I know, also, that in too many

cases the facts are otherwise, and the increase has come from a class which is very much better off than the wage-earning class; from the class of capitalists who have found it convenient and profitable in the dearth of safe and easily convertible investments to

#### WITHDRAW THEIR ACCUMULATIONS

from the mass of circulating capital and to sink it in the national debt on the advantageous terms offered by the Government. This does not help the wage-earner. It hurts him by hurting the general business of the country and establishing, without that justification which I have shown exists in the case of the wage-earner, an undue competition between the Government and the instrumentalities which exist for the collective and active employment in the general business of the available capital of the community. (Cheers.) Now on some other branches of the labour question I would like to speak to you as a wage-earning community, but on the whole I have thought it best to ask the reporter to reproduce an extract of my speech of 1882, which dealt with those topics; and to pass on to-night to some fresher subjects.

---

The extract from MR. BLAKE'S speech referred to is as follows

Without having made it the subject of an election cry or seeking to pose as the workingman's friend, I am prepared to affirm that the Liberal Administration of 1874 to 1878 paid more attention to the well-being, the social status, and the interests of the workingman than any administration which preceded or followed it; and that the particular interest which the Conservative party paid to the workingman was limited to the imposition on his shoulders of an enormous, unequal, and unjust taxation.

What was the position of the workingman in 1874, when the Liberal party came into power? A law had been put on the statute book a few years before with a great flourish of trumpets, as a great boon to the workingman, but it was found not long afterward

#### THAT PROMISED BOON WAS A BURDEN.

It was unsatisfactory in one important particular—that it was a measure of class legislation, dealing specially with the master and servant, and almost entirely in favour of the former and against the latter.

It was a law which, according to the interpretation of the word "intimidation," made it a criminal offence to watch a place of business with a view to obtain information while disputes respecting wages were in progress. It provided that the trial and conviction of those persons should be before two magistrates, and that

in all such cases the law of conspiracy should remain in full force. The Liberal Government, of which I myself was Minister of Justice, found this law on the statute book when they came into office. We set about to amend it, and we wiped out the odious element of class legislation altogether by repealing those provisions which applied to the master and servant. We also defined and limited the word "intimidation" so as to make it apply only where violence was threatened to person or property. We especially made it lawful to watch places of business for the purpose of receiving or communicating information. We allowed the accused under the law

#### THE OPTION OF TRIAL BY JURY,

and we abolished the odious application of the law of conspiracy under which, by the ruling of the courts, it had been made criminal for two or three workmen to combine together to accomplish objects which, if attained by any one of them singly, would be quite lawful. But that was not all. There were other laws on the statute book in which the doctrine of class legislation appeared in even more odious form. Under the ordinary law a breach of contract was merely a civil wrong, but to that general law there was an odious exception which prevailed in this country up to 1877. That exception provided that violation of agreements between master and servant, refusal to go to work, leaving employment without permission, or refusal to obey lawful commands, were punishable by fine and imprisonment as a crime. In the case of ordinary contracts there was no crime in the breach, but where it came to violation of agreements between master and servant the accused was liable to be sent to gaol. In my Act, repealing the former one, I redressed this grievance by declaring that breaches of contract, whether between master and servant or otherwise, shall only be regarded as civil wrongs and not as crimes.

Under these circumstances I was a little amused to see that Mr. Costigan has taken the credit to Tory legislation of having opened the door to the poor man to rise to positions of honour and trust, especially so when I contrast the professions of the hon. gentleman with one of the latest acts performed by the late Parliament and consummated by Tory influence. I hold that the highest position to which a citizen can aspire is that of being the representative of his fellow-citizens in the Parliament of the country.

The law, as it stood till quite recently, required a deposit of \$50 from each candidate for election. I think that even that was an unjust requirement, but during the last session, the Tories pro-

posed and they had carried in their gerrymandering bill, as one of its chief ornaments, a clause which increased this deposit from \$50 to \$200. When the bill was before the House, I moved an amendment to reduce the \$200 to \$50, but the Tory party, who were so desirous that the way and the path to honour should be kept open, declined to reduce it. There is another measure which it seems to me is in striking contrast to the Tory professions of interest in the workingman which becomes so profuse about election times. This is

#### THE SEAMAN'S ACT,

which was passed in great haste in 1873, and which provided that any one going on board a vessel for any purpose without permission of the master was guilty of a criminal offence, punishable with five years' imprisonment in penitentiary, and triable, as was contended by the courts, before the Police Magistrate alone, without the option of a judge or jury. The amended bill, passed by the House last session, provided that the crime should not be for going but for staying on board. It provided also for a possible reduction of the punishment to two years' imprisonment, but it made clear and beyond a doubt the provision respecting punishment—declaring that it should be only before the Police Magistrate. I moved an amendment, providing that in a case so serious that it permitted a maximum penalty of five years' imprisonment, the accused should have the benefit of trial by a jury of his peers, and the Government, and the Tory party, and Mr. Costigan, and all those friends of the workingman voted that amendment down, and deliberately said that the guilt or innocence of the party charged with this offence should be determined by a single judge of an inferior jurisdiction. \* \* \* \* Coming next to the Insolvent Law, I do not blame the Government for having repealed it on the whole, but it was well known that it contained provisions respecting liens which specially affected the workingmen, and that they had not been benefited by such repeal. There was another boon which the Tories had given to the workingman, and that was high taxes. Since the delusive promises held out to the workingmen in 1878, they had probably learned, many of them, that neither law, National Policy, nor tariff, would ensure their share in the profits of their labour, but that they would have to depend for this on their own exertions and concerted action, and that they would be exposed year after year to the operation of the law of demand and of competition on securing a proper return for the labour of their hands. The Government was alive to this fact also, and

IN GIVING A CONTRACT ON THE PACIFIC RAILWAY TO ONDERDONK AT A HIGHER PRICE THAN WAS TENDERED FOR BY OTHERS, THEY ADMITTED THEIR KNOWLEDGE OF THE FACT THAT AS ONDERDONK HAD AN ADJOINING CONTRACT, THE COMPETITION FOR LABOUR WOULD BE DIMINISHED MUCH MORE THAN IF THE CONTRACT WAS LET TO A NEW FIRM. (Loud and prolonged cheering.)

## ORGANIZED LABOR'S ENEMY.

### TORY TYRANNY.

Men Bounced for Belonging to Labor Organizations — The Intercolonial Case—Sir John Macdonald's Denial—Mr. Blake's Reply.

MR. BLAKE, in the course of his address at Hamilton, criticized, as he has done at other places, Sir John Macdonald's speech made at Ottawa, and intended to show the claims of the Conservative party upon the workingmen. He said:—I observe by the report of his speeches that Sir John Macdonald has tried to meet some of my criticisms, especially one, to which I may refer, that the Government which pretended to have so strong an interest in trades unions and combinations of workingmen had itself discharged employees on the Intercolonial Railway under its management because they were members of a labour organization. My speech on that point was made at Deseronto. Sir John Macdonald visited Deseronto some time afterwards—he has been following me pretty closely—(laughter)—and he said:—

Not long ago Mr. Blake in a speech, delivered, he believed, in that identical village, said that the Government had dismissed men employed on the Intercolonial Railway because they belonged to trades unions. On behalf of the Government he gave that statement the most clear and decided contradiction, and would challenge Mr. Blake on the floor of Parliament when it met again, to verify the statement that either on the Intercolonial or on any public work, big or little, had a man been dismissed for belonging to a trades union. (Loud cheers.) He would challenge Mr. Blake to give the particulars, and if that hon. gentleman did not do so he would stand convicted of having maligned the Government of the day. (Hear, hear.)

I stand by what I said. (Hear, hear.) I do not wait for the time of the assembling of Parliament to meet his challenge.

#### I MEET IT HERE

and now. (Loud applause.) I believe the facts to be that about the year 1881 an order was given to the engineers on the Inter-colonial, who were members of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, that they should either leave the Brotherhood or take their discharge. Some of the engineers felt that they could not resist the Government, and were forced to leave the Brotherhood, but the remainder, about a dozen men, I believe, refused to leave the Brotherhood and were obliged to take their discharge. (Shame!) These poor fellows appealed to their brethren. The Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers is a very powerful body, and its members took up the case. A committee was appointed from the various railways in various parts of Canada. This committee went to Sir John Macdonald, the very man who has denied this charge, and has called upon me to prove it. They represented the case to him and called for the repeal of the order. I believe, though of this I am not certain, that they went also to the Acting Minister of Railways. But nothing was done. After a while Sir Charles Tupper, the Minister of Railways, returned. He saw the power of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, he knew there was a freemasonry between the members of all labour organizations, he saw the political effect of the situation, and at length the order was repealed and most of the men went back. I believe these are the facts of the case, and these are the facts upon which I rely to establish that the present Government did dismiss men from the Intercolonial Railway for belonging to a labour organization. (Loud applause).

Now, with reference to the arrest of the printers, you may remember that Sir John Macdonald boasted that he had legislated so as to relieve them. I showed that his legislation had excepted their cases and had not relieved them. (Laughter.) He also declared that he "happened to be Minister of Justice and Attorney-General, and that, in his capacity of Minister of Justice, he advised the representative of the Sovereign to at once release those printers and allow them to walk out once more as free men." I showed that they were never in gaol, and so could not have been "released and allowed to walk forth as free men." (Laughter.) I showed that they had been only bailed to appear at their trial, and so could not have been released by Sir John Macdonald in any sense, the matter being purely local, and not federal. (Laughter.) I showed that, in fact, he neither released them nor tried to release them; and I declared the whole story to be a slip of the



memory. (Laughter.) *He afterwards repeated it.* Thereupon I felt bound to restate the facts, and did so at St. Thomas, where I was still charitable enough to treat his statements as lapses of memory, or tricks of imagination. I told the people there that he had

#### GONE OVER THIS OLD STORY SO OFTEN

that he firmly believed it true; that he reminded me of King George IV., who was, you know, a very respectable monarch, as Sir John is a very respectable Minister—(laughter)—but who told a good many strange stories. (Laughter.) He was fond, was George IV., of uniforms and of military display; and, by dint of long telling the story, he got firmly to believe at last that he had been at the battle of Waterloo—(laughter)—and had led a desperate charge against the French at the head of his regiment. (Loud laughter.) After repeating this for many years, one night, being in the company of the great Duke of Wellington, he told it again, and appealed to the Duke to confirm it. "Arthur," said the King, "you know I was there." The Duke was in a quandary, between his devotion to the sovereign and his duty to the truth. (Laughter.) He reconciled them by answering, "*I have often heard your Majesty say so.*" (Roars of laughter.) So, I said, you may reply to Sir John Macdonald. (Laughter.) Well, after this further denial, the matter became more serious. He followed me at St. Thomas, and could not avoid discussing the question. He knew of my repeated challenge; he had the opportunity, and it was his duty to refresh that faded memory, to curb that vivid imagination, and to re-examine the facts of the case. My charitable excuses can serve no longer for what he there said.

#### WHAT DID HE SAY? THIS:

Mr. Blake had lately referred to that speech and stated that the printers were never sent to prison at all—that they had only been guilty of a misdemeanour, which was a bailable offence. Those men were, however, arrested. The hand of a constable was laid on their shoulder. They were under arrest and had ceased to be free men just as much as if they were under a gaoler's lock and key. Mr. Blake had said he (Sir John) never released these men. Well, what he did do was to send up a *nolle prosequi*, an order to stop the prosecution, but such a storm of indignation had arisen that this did not need to be acted on, and Mr. Brown was compelled by the force of public opinion to stop the prosecution himself."

We are now face to face with a serious question.

First of all he now admits that the men were never in gaol, next that he never advised the Governor-General to release them, and impliedly that he could not do so.

*But he has a new story, he tells a fresh tale.*

He says he sent up a "nolle prosequi," an order to stop the prosecution.

I deny the statement; *it is not true.*

In the first place,

#### NO BILL HAD BEEN PRESENTED TO, OR FOUND

by, the grand jury, and therefore, as Sir John Macdonald once knew, there could be no *nolle prosequi* at all. (Great laughter and applause.) But, in the second place, had there been a bill, Sir John Macdonald, as Attorney-General of the Dominion, had not, as he once knew, any power to send up a *nolle prosequi*. (Renewed laughter and applause.) The whole Dominion Government, with its army, navy and volunteers could not send up an efficacious *nolle prosequi*. (Cheers and laughter.) Any attempt to do it would have been an impudent nullity. It is part of the administration of justice. It is a local function. And, in the third place, as a matter of fact,

#### SIR JOHN MADE NO SUCH ATTEMPT.

(Uproarious laughter.) *I have caused the records to be searched and there is no proof that Sir John ever attempted any such thing.* But you may say that he ordered the prosecution to be stopped. He says so. But it is not true. He did not do it. He did not try to do it. He could not have done it had he tried.

#### IT IS ALL A FABRICATION.

Yet the prosecution was in fact, stopped and abandoned. Was that a creditable act? Was it an act the author of which should be supported by workingmen? Sir John says so. (Loud applause.) He appeals for the support of the workingmen of Canada on the ground that he ordered the abandonment of this prosecution. He says that the man who did that is worthy the support of every man who believes in the right of the workingmen to combine for their own advantage. I agree with him, and I ask you to-night to give your support to the man who did it. It is the man whom Sir John Macdonald is seeking to discredit and destroy, it is

#### OLIVER MOWAT,

Attorney-General of Ontario. (Tremendous applause.) He was sworn into office on the 31st of October, 1872, and took up this question and ordered the abandonment of the prosecution on the 7th November—within seven days of the time he was sworn into office—(Renewed applause.) I have here the return of Mr. Ken-

neth Mackenzie, Q.C., the Crown prosecutor, which he made on this case to the Crown Office:—

J. C. McMan and others : offence, conspiracy against master printers. Nothing was done in this case, the Attorney-General considering it was not desirable under the circumstances to proceed any further, so that the prosecution on the part of the Crown has been abandoned.

K. MACKENZIE.

Mr. Mowat did his duty in this matter. But he never said anything about it; he has been before you in several elections since that; but he never came before you claiming your support because he had done what was his duty. Mr. Mowat never tried to make party capital out of the discharge of his duty in the administration of criminal justice, even by telling you the truth as to the law and the facts. But here you find this other gentleman misrepresenting the facts, and saying he did what he did not do, misrepresenting the law, and saying he did what he could not do, and so seeking by an impudent misstatement to get credit to himself and inflict damage on his opponents. (Applause.) And I think it was full time to

STRIP HIM OF HIS BORROWED PLUMES,

to pluck away his stolen feathers, to restore them to their real owner, and leave the culprit "naked, shivering, and"—not "ashamed." (Loud laughter and applause.) Judge of his other claims to support by this claim. (Hear, hear.) They have just as little foundation and merit. This is a sample case of his accuracy in his facts, of his correctness in his law, and of his fairness in controversy. (Loud and prolonged applause.)

(12)